

REMARKS

An interview with the examiner on June 27, 2005, included a reiteration of the distinctions of the claimed invention compared with Liu's method as discussed in a previous interview with the examiner on November 16, 2004. As discussed in the both interviews, Liu does not disclose or suggest combining content and layout elements according to at least one binding in a binding specification. In contrast, Liu generates a document based on style and content as described, for example, in col. 3, lines 3-7.

The examiner once again indicated that claims would likely be patentable. The examiner also indicated that she would perform an additional search and either issue a notice of allowance or issue a new, non-final office action based on new prior art.


The applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

The fact that the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes any positions of the examiner. The fact that the applicant has asserted certain grounds for the patentability of a claim does not mean that there are not other good grounds for patentability of that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/1/5



David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906